

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested U.S. patent application numbers on page 1 of the specification; requested formal drawings be submitted; rejected claims 1, 3-8, 13, 14, 21, 22, 23-27, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Felciano (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,730) and rejected claims 47, 10-12, 15-20, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36 and 39-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Felciano.

By way of this amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 6-8, 10, 15, 20, 24-26, 29, 32, 34, 35, and 39-47 without prejudice or disclaimer and amended claims 1, 11, 12, 16, 27, 28, 31, 33, and 36 to improve form. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 11-14, 16-19, 21-23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, and 36-38 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, the Examiner objected to the page 1 of the Specification for failing to include U.S. Patent Application numbers for the cross-referenced applications listed thereon. The Examiner's attention is directed to Applicants' Amendment dated August 18, 2004 in which Applicants, by amendment, removed reference to the co-pending applications. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending objection are respectfully requested.

Additionally, the Examiner has requested that Applicants submit formal drawings in the present application. As the Examiner is aware, this application is not a candidate for publication. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request abeyance of this request prior to an indication of allowability for at least some claims in the present application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1, 3-8, 13, 14, 21-27, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by FELCIANO et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,730). Claims 47, 10-12, 15-20, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36 and 39-45 were similarly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over FELCIANO et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1, as amended recites a method for exchanging information between a first server and a second server, the first and second servers being coupled to a network. The method includes: receiving a request from a requestor, the request indicating that a secure connection from the first server to the second server is required, wherein the request further includes at least a port number; identifying an initial hostname portion of the request associated with a network address of the first server; retrieving a replacement hostname portion for the request from storage associated with the first server based on at least the port number and the initial hostname portion, wherein the replacement hostname portion is associated with a network address of the second server; replacing the initial hostname portion with the replacement hostname portion to form the modified request; forwarding the modified request to the second server using the replacement hostname portion; receiving information associated with the modified request from the second server; and modifying the received information to associate the received information with the first server, wherein modifying the received information further comprises modifying at least one original URL link in the received information to form at least one modified link associated with the at least one original URL link and the

first server, such that selection of the at least one modified link results in requests being directed toward the first server.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Furthermore, a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires that three basic criteria be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not the applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)

FELCIANO et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in Applicants' claim 1.

For example, FELCIANO et al. does not disclose or suggest that the request includes at least a port number and retrieving a replacement hostname portion for the request from storage associated with the first server based on at least the port number, as required by claim 1. This feature of claim 1 was formerly included within dependent claims 15 and 47, rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In making the § 103 rejection, the Examiner indicated merely that if the replacement hostname in FELCIANO et al. is stored in a storage which requires a port number for addressing, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to retrieve the replacement hostname

portion using a port number so as to obtain the hostname. (Office Action pg. 4).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

FELCIANO et al. may be fairly interpreted as disclosing a gateway server implemented by modifying a received URL associated with a Gateway server (e.g., the Lamprey server in FELCIANO), to direct a request to a target server designated in the initially received URL request. However, FELCIANO et al. does not disclose or suggest modifying the received URL based on information not included within the received URL. As noted in the present specification at pages 23 and 24, secure communications between the various servers and the requestor require that the identity of the second server not be directly identifiable from the received request. Accordingly, it is not possible to simply strip information from the initially received request to form a modified request. As recited in claim 1, the replacement hostname portion for the request is retrieved from a storage associated with the first server based on a port number included within the request.

FELCIANO et al. neither discloses nor remotely suggests generating a modified request based on information stored at the first server and associated with a port number received in a request. In fact, FELCIANO clearly teaches that the received requests include, as parameters, the original URL's (see FELCIANO et al. at col. 4, lines 14-17). For at least this reason claim 1 is patentable over FELCIANO et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5, 11-14, 16-19, 21-23 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable over FELCIANO et al. for at least the reasons claim 1 is allowable. Moreover, these claims include additional features neither disclosed nor suggested by FELCIANO et al.

For example, claim 5 recites that a cookie, previously provided by the second server, is stored on or associated with the first server and is associated with the requestor and the second server, and that the modified request together with the cookie is forwarded to the second server using the replacement hostname portion. The Examiner failed to specifically point out the basis for his rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 or §102. Upon a thorough review, it is clear that FELCIANO et al. does not disclose the existence or usage of cookies or similar identification information in any manner. Further, the gateway server of FELCIANO et al. is not taught to perform any function other than to modify URL's and to log HTTP request information. For at least this additional reason claim 5 is patentable over FELCIANO et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 are therefore respectfully requested.

Independent claim 27 includes features similar to, but different in scope from, those set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 27 is patentable over FELCIANO for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to claim 1.

Claims 28 and 30 depend from claim 27 and are therefore considered allowable over FELCIANO et al. for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to claim 27.

Independent claim 31 includes features similar to, but different in scope from, those set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 31 is patentable over FELCIANO for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to claim 1.

Claims 33, 36, and 37 depend from claim 31 and are therefore considered allowable over FELCIANO et al. for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to claim 31.

Independent claim 38 includes features similar to, but different in scope from, those set forth above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 38 is patentable over FELCIANO for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, with respect to claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 11-14, 16-19, 21-23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 based on FELCIANO et al.

If the Examiner does not believe that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: 

Robin C. Clark
Registration No. 40,956

Date: February 21, 2006

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800